

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed April 25, 2003, the Examiner noted that claims 1-13 were pending and rejected all claims. New claims 14 has been added and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1-14 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections and objections are traversed below.

On page 3 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Chiba. On page 4 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2 and 4-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Lopresti. Page 7 of the Office Action rejects claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Lopresti and Kenley.

The present invention is directed to a system for managing files in a situation where the file storage capacity is limited. In particular, the present invention is directed to a system in which the files have attributes, such creation date, size, type, etc. The system uses ranking rules or a ranking rule base to rank the files as to importance based on the plural attributes. When the system capacity is reached and no new files can be included, the system reduces data of the files in the system according to the ranking created by the rules based ranking system. The data reduction includes deleting the files, data compression of the files, file summarization and savings the files to non-system storage. In the present system the data reduction for a file (as opposed to a part of a file) is driven by rules that rank the files based on plural attributes of the files. The ranking of each document is thus flexible as opposed to fixed. These features are emphasized in the claims.

Chiba, in contrast, is directed to a system for managing storage in a handheld device. Document data is converted into a structured document where the data is divided into different sections based on the attributes of the data, such as image data, text data, table data, graphic data, etc. The structural divisions are determined or set by the handheld device user. When the capacity limit is reached, the sections of the documents are deleted in a predetermined manner to free up storage space. The deletion of the sections is determined by a priority determined or set by the user where figure 6. There is no discussion or teaching in Chiba suggesting that ranking of document files using rules that rank based on document attributes be used for document management much less data reduction.

Lopresti, like Chiba, divides documents into sections (logical sections) which functions much like Chiba to divide the documents into text sections, image sections, etc. Lopresti

reduces the storage utilization or size like Chiba by processing the different sections of the documents. The different sections are reduced in storage space by, for example, compressing a section, reducing the resolution of the section or discarding the section. The trigger for compressing the sections or discarding them is based on the time in which the sections of the document have been resident in the system. There is no discussion or teaching in Lopresti suggesting that ranking of document files using rules that rank based on document attributes be used for document management much less data reduction.

Kenley adds nothing to the prior art of Lopresti or Chiba with respect to the features of the invention discussed above. In particular, there is no discussion or teaching in Kenley suggesting that ranking of document files using rules that rank based on document attributes be used for document management much less data reduction.

It is submitted that the invention of the independent claims distinguishes over the prior art and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

The dependent claims depend from the above-discussed independent claims and are patentable over the prior art for the reasons discussed above. The dependent claims also recite additional features not taught or suggested by the prior art. For example, claim 3 emphasizes weighting the attributes, claim 5 emphasizes that idle time of the system is used for ranking and claim 9 emphasizes control of reduction processing based on a target reduction speed and the actual reduction speed. These features, among others in the dependent claims, are not taught or suggested by the prior art. It is submitted that the dependent claims are independently patentable over the prior art.

New claim 14 emphasizes the features of the invention discussed above. Nothing in the prior art teaches or suggests such. It is submitted that the new claim distinguishes over the prior art.


It is submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 7/25/13

By: 
J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501